

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 6 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4 and 6 can be found at least at page 10, lines 14-16 and 22-25 of the specification and in Fig. 6. Claim 11 is amended solely for clarity. Thus, no new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**A. Chen in view of Merrill**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 6 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281) in view of Merrill (U.S. Patent No. 6,789,228). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, Applicants assert that neither Chen nor Merrill, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a retrieval result display unit that displays retrieved relevant static image data, varying size of the displayed relevant static image data based on (1) a time length of a corresponding video scene in which the static image data is associated, and (2) an amount of change in scene contents of a corresponding video scene in which the static image data is associated, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 4 and 6.

To the contrary, Chen merely discloses a primary slide window 510 that displays a current (active) slide and smaller previous and subsequent slides in a thumbnail area 540. The difference in size between the current slide and the thumbnails is only the result of the fact that the larger slide is the active slide and not because that current slide corresponds to a video portion of larger duration and a video with a larger amount of change in scene contents, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 4 and 6.

Further, Merrill merely discloses a front-end interface 900 that allows for a user to search for lecture information by use of a search box 912. Additionally, the front-end interface 900 merely displays a slide image 902 of a portion of the lecture.

Similarly, as previously relied on by the Examiner, Hull, Jensen and Uchihashi, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a retrieval result display unit that displays retrieved relevant static image data, varying size of the displayed relevant static image data based on (1) a time length of a corresponding video scene in which the static image data is associated, and (2) an amount of change in scene contents of a corresponding video scene in which the static image data is associated, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 4 and 6.

In particular, the Office Action mailed May 9, 2008 concedes that both Hull (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,371) and Jensen (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,371) fail to disclose the claimed retrieval results display unit.

Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, both Chen and Uchihashi ("Video Manga: Generating Semantically Meaningful Video Summaries," Proceedings of the ACM Multimedia, pp. 383-392, 1999) fail to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Hull and Jensen.

Specifically, as discussed above, Chen merely discloses a primary slide window 510 that displays an active slide and smaller previous and subsequent slides in a thumbnail area 540. The difference in size between the active slide and the thumbnails is only the result of the fact that the larger slide is the active slide.

Further, Uchihashi merely discloses varying the size of segments based on an importance value associated with the segments. The importance values are calculated based on the rarity of the segment and the duration of the segment (*see* §4.2 of Uchihashi).

Additionally, Honda (U.S. Patent No. 6,988,244) merely discloses indicator bars 107a and 108a that each correspond to the length of all of the corresponding moving pictures (the

total reproduction time) (*see* col. 8, lines 20-35 and in Fig. 4). In other words, the indicator bars 107a and 108a are merely indicating the total length of the video files and are not static images. Even assuming that the indicator bars 107a and 108a are static images, the indicator bars 107a and 108a are not static images that have been varied in size based on the length of a corresponding video and an amount of change in scene contents of a corresponding video scene in which the static image data is associated.

For at least the reasons discussed above, neither Chen nor Merrill, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 6. Therefore, independent claims 1, 4 and 6 remain patentable over the combination of references. Claim 9 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Claim 10 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 4, as well as for the additional features it recites. Claim 11 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 6, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Similarly, for at least the reasons discussed above, any combination of the previously applied art (Hull, Jensen, Uchihashi and Honda) fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**B. Chen in view of Merrill and in further view of Clements**

The Office Action rejects claim 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Merrill and in further view of Clements (Cardillo and Miller Phonetic Searching of Digital Audio, Published 2001, Washington National Association of Broadcasters, pages 131-140). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Clements fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Chen and Merrill. Therefore, independent claims 1, 4 and 6 remain patentable over the combination of references.

Claim 12 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Claim 13 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 4, as well as for the additional features it recites. Claim 14 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 6, as well as for the additional features it recites. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jay R. Bombien  
Registration No. 66,569

JAO:JQB/ccs

Date: June 21, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry of this filing;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461